

MEETING SUMMARY

CINCINNATI MUNICIPAL AIRPORT-LUNKEN AIRPORT CTAG #9 August 17, 2004

Meeting called by: City of Cincinnati
Meeting summary prepared by Cheri Rekow and PB Aviation

Attendees:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Michael Burns, Indian Hill 2. Andy Radin, Board of Realtors (for John Frank) 3. Erik Nelson, Private Pilots 4. Pat McDevitt, Linwood Community Council 5. Mike Lacinak, Mt. Washington Community Council 6. Andrew Betts, Sierra Club 7. Krissi Barr, Cincinnati Business Committee 8. Eileen Enabnit, Director, DOT&E 9. David Rattenbury, Cincinnati Flight Training, CTAG-AC (for Dan O'Neil, CTAG) 10. Cheri Rekow, DOT&E Aviation 11. Bob Vickrey, City of Cincinnati, DOT&E 12. Mike Brenner, DOT&E Aviation Division | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 13. David Schlothauer, PB Aviation 14. Ed Cecil, PB Aviation 15. Suzanne Geckle, PB Aviation 16. Tracy Beach, PB Aviation 17. Vivian Llambi, Llambi & Associates 18. Ken O'Dea, Llambi & Associates 19. Debbie Conrad, KCAB-CVG 20. Steve Fagel, City of Cincinnati, Law 21. Tom Ewing, Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce 22. Salty Roark 23. Ian Scott 24. Susan Holzapfel, LAOAB 25. Brian Snyder, HCPC |
|---|--|

Agenda Topic	Presenter	Discussion
Greeting & Introductions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City staff, Consultants CTAG and CTAG/AC members • Opening comments 	Eileen Enabnit, Director, DOT&E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ms. Enabnit welcomed each of the returning CTAG members and initiated introduction of those in attendance. • Mr. David Schlothauer further introduced members from PB Aviation and Sub-consulting firm of Vivian Llambi and Associates.
Review of CTAG Meeting #8	Cheri Rekow, Senior City Planner, DOT&E, Aviation	Ms. Rekow reported that there were no comments or edits to the CTAG Meeting #8-May 18 2004, summary that was distributed for review last month via e-mail.
Preferred Airport Layout Plan (Chapter 6)	Ed Cecil, PB Aviation	<p>Mr. Cecil discussed the refinements that were made to the Preferred Airport Layout Plan in terms of FAA protocol. Mr. Cecil also discussed the projects on the ALP Phasing plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The three-phase development plan includes 36 capital improvement projects. The twelve (12) Phase I projects are required to address FAA obstruction removal issues, noise mitigation projects, terminal parking, and the environmental study that is required for the proposed runway extension. • The six (6) Phase-II projects are required for the proposed 899 ft. extension to Runway 3R, Airport Road maintenance, and a self-fuel island that is required as part of the on-going Lease Area 50 T-Hangar project. • The eighteen (18) Phase III projects are required to accommodate the long-range lease area expansion requirements of the existing tenants. At such time new hangars and aprons are required, it is proposed that Taxiway 'C' be relocated to the north by 1,000 ft. If

		<p>required, this taxiway relocation project could be accomplished in three phases.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The last three projects (34,35,36) are not tied to demand forecasts. At such time as a private developer wishes to team with the City on a proposed office park development, the plan recommends relocation of the Airport Road levee and acquisition of approximately 15 acres of property along Kellogg Avenue. • The ALP package that contains 13 drawings is being reviewed by the City and after this review, a preliminary set of the plans will be sent to the FAA Detroit District office for review. After the initial review of the plans by the FAA, eight sets of the plans will be submitted to the FAA for formal review and approval. This ALP approval process typically takes 6-12 months. • An Airport Master Plan Update executive summary is being drafted.
Landscape Concept Plan and Concepts Presentation& discussion)	David Schlothauer, PB Aviation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Schlothauer introduced sub-consultant, Vivian Llambi of Llambi and Associates. • Ms. Llambi presented the overall Landscape Plan and concepts including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Improvements to separate pedestrian/bike/vehicular traffic in front of the Terminal building. ○ Improvements to Wilmer Avenue along the corporate hangers with curbs and gutters, vegetation and points of ingress/egress and to improve drainage. ○ Improvements to sections of the bike trail. • Mr. Tom Ewing commented favorably on the concepts particularly the pedestrian/vehicular separation at the terminal. • Mr. Pat McDevitt expressed concern about the possible cage or tunnel-effect of the fencing depicted along realigned portions of the bike trail adjacent to the golf course. The consultants responded that this would only apply to short sections that were prone to airborne golf balls. Bob Vickery added that safety is a primary concern for the CRC.
Chapter 5	Suzanne Geckle, PB Aviation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ms. Geckle presented the findings of the Lunken Airport Environmental Review Chapter: • The findings of the preliminary analysis of the 22 environmental review categories indicated that no significant issues have been identified that cannot be mitigated in a logical manner. • The proposed extension of Runway 3R will not have a major effect on surface drainage, no residential units would be located within the 65-DNL noise contour, and the site that is to be developed has previously been disturbed. • At such time as Taxiway 'C' is relocated, the 45-acre mid-field storm water detention basin would have to be relocated to a site east of Runway 3R-21L. This project would have to be coordinated with the Corp of Engineers. • The proposed long-term relocation of the Airport Road levee would require coordination with the Corp of Engineers and the auto salvage yard would require environmental agency coordination in the clean-up process. • Environmental Assessment should be started as early as possible in case mitigation is required prior to breaking ground on a project. • Mr. Eric Partee submitted a prior e-mail noting that any publicly funded projects within 1,000 feet of the riverbank (OHW) of the Little Miami National & State Scenic River require approval by the

		<p>Ohio Department of Natural Resources and the National Park Service.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In response to a question by Mr. Andy Betts, Ms. Geckle replied that she would check with OEPA regarding warm water habitats.
BREAK		<p>Opportunity for CTAG members and meeting attendees to review the presentation boards in detail and discuss one-on-one with consultants.</p>
Public Question & Answer	David Schlothauer, PB Aviation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mr. Schlothauer opened up the floor to questions regarding Chapters 5 and 6 and the Landscape plan. Mr. Schlothauer introduced Tracy Beach, PB Aviation who is responsible for doing the FAA required financial feasibility analysis.
Chapter 7	Tracy Beach, PB Aviation	<p>Ms. Beach presented information regarding the feasibility analysis being prepared as part of the Master Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ms. Beach indicated that the projects contained in the Master Plan CIP were for the most part eligible for Federal funding at the 95% participation level; however, eligibility and priority from the FAA's standpoint would determine if the Airport would receive funding for certain projects. Ms. Beach discussed the steps taken to complete a financial feasibility analysis for a Master Plan including determining funding sources, as well as projecting revenues, expenses, and net cash flow. Ms. Beach also discussed that PB Aviation could also discuss project priority with FAA and include this information in the feasibility analysis.
Next Steps	Cheri Rekow, DOT&E, Aviation Division	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Master Plan Exhibit - August 17-19, 2004 during office hours at the Lunken Airport Terminal Building. Public Workshop #2 - August 19, 2004, 4PM-7PM Carnegie Center, 3738 Eastern Ave. Next CTAG Meeting: September 7, 2004, 4PM- 6PM H.C. Nutting Office <p>Topics to include: Review of public workshop, final chapters.</p> <p>Other opportunities for public review and comment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LAOAB September 13, 2004 (regular meeting) City Council Community Development, Education, and Intergovernmental Affairs Hearing (regular meeting in Sept. - TBA)

Question/Comment & Answer Period

CTAG # 8 August 17, 2004

1. It was understood that proposed projects would be “triggered” by operations (forecasted activity) however, there aren’t any “trigger points” linked to project implementation recommendations or the ALP phasing plan. (Pat McDevitt, CTAG Community Rep.)

RESPONSE

- a. The twelve (12) Phase I capital development projects are not tied to aviation demand forecasts. These projects are required to address FAA obstruction clearance and noise mitigation issues.
- b. The six (6) Phase II projects are not tied to aviation demand forecasts. These projects are required to address the runway length requirements of a new corporate jet that requires 7,000 ft. to be able to fly non-stop to Asia from Cincinnati, Airport Road maintenance, and a fuel island that is tied to the on-going T-Hangar development project. (Note: The runway extension was approved by City Council in May 2004)
- c. The first fifteen (15) Phase III projects are tied to the aviation demand forecasts. Due to the lack of property available for hangar and apron expansion, Taxiway ‘C’ is recommended to be relocated 1,000 ft to the north. This will provide approximately 45 acres of additional lease area for the airport tenants. As specific tenants acquire additional aircraft, Taxiway ‘C’ would be relocated in three phases.
- d. The last three (3) projects (34, 35, 36) are not tied to aviation demand forecasts. The development of the Airport Office Park and the relocation of the Airport Road levee could be developed at such time as the City finds a private developer that is interested in the project.

Mr. McDevitt stated that he appreciated that certain projects have an immediate need but that projects through 2022 should be based on activity linked to the forecast.

2. Master Plan Goal #7 and its objectives are not developed in the Master Plan. The Plan falls short by not establishing monitoring and reporting methods as stated in the Mission/Goals/Objectives. (Pat McDevitt)

Response: The plan serves as a guide. The goals and objectives, like the projects such as the runway extension, are recommendations to be implemented once the plan is approved, pending a need or demand.

The Master Plan also references the Part 150 Noise Study, which includes in its recommendations installation of the AirScene System, which will make possible more accurate noise monitoring and reporting.

Meeting Adjourned

5:45 PM